

REMARKS

Claims 1, 5, 10-13, 15-16, 18-23, 25-26 and 28-36 are pending in the subject application. Of those claims, claims 1, 5, 10, 15, 20, 25 and 31 are independent. By the Amendment herewith, Applicant clarifies independent claims 1, 5, 10, 15, 20, 25 and 31 as supported by the as filed application at, for example, page 4, pages 13-14, Figures 5 and 6, and the Abstract. For example, as described at page 4, allowing a reminder to be set up remotely provides further enhanced functionality. A reminder may be set by the user him/herself on a PC or other communications terminal, or by a colleague, a friend or a family member of the user, for example.

No new matter is introduced into the application as a result of the foregoing claim amendments.

Referring now to the outstanding non-final Office Action, it is noted that the Examiner has withdrawn all of the rejections set forth in the prior Office Action in view of Applicant's reply dated June 15, 2009. However, the Examiner now cites a new ground of rejection in the outstanding Action. More particularly, in the outstanding non-final Office Action, only one outstanding issue remains - - all pending claims are rejected under 35 USC Section 102(e) as being anticipated by newly cited Tokkonen (US Patent Publication 2003/0087665, hereinafter "Tokkonen").

The foregoing rejection is respectfully disagreed with, and is traversed below.

Tokkonen discloses a reminder function for a mobile communication device. According to Tokkonen at paragraph [0014], the process begins at step 200 when a user of a mobile telephone 1 initiates the reminder function. This may be done by selecting a menu function using display 16 and keypad 15 of the mobile telephone 1. See also Figure 2 of Tokkonen. As further described at paragraph [0014] and shown in Figure 3 of Tokkonen, the mobile telephone 1 prompts the user for input selecting and creating or editing the type of reminder the user desires.

Tokkonen does not disclose a method as recited in independent claim 1, "wherein the reminder is entered into the memory of the mobile communications device by a remote terminal, which is remote from the mobile communications device." (Emphasis added).

In contrast, according to Tokkonen, the user of the mobile device 1 enters the reminder directly into the mobile device 1.

Accordingly, for at least the above reason, independent claim 1 is novel in view of Tokkonen.

Similarly, Applicant's remaining independent claims recite, in part:

5. "A device comprising to determine if the event is associated with a reminder item stored in a memory of the device by a remote terminal ... wherein the remote terminal is remote from the mobile communications device."

10. "A method comprising: in operating a mobile communications device, ... storing the reminder with an application indicator and the identifier in a memory of the mobile communications device by a remote terminal, which is remote from the mobile communications device."

15. "A method ... wherein the reminder is entered into the memory of the mobile communications device by a remote terminal, which is remote from the mobile communications device."

20. "A device comprising wherein the controller is further configured to allow the reminder to be entered into the memory of the mobile communications device by a remote terminal, which is remote from the mobile communications device."

25. "A device comprising ... and to store the reminder with the or another application indicator and the identifier in a memory of the device by a remote

terminal, wherein the device is a mobile communications device and the remote terminal is remote from the mobile communications device.”

31. “A method comprising ... and wherein the reminder is entered into the memory of the mobile communications device by a remote terminal, which is remote from the mobile communications device.”

For the reasons set forth above, Tokkonen also does not disclose Applicant's claimed method and device reciting the above features of independent claims 5, 10, 15, 20, 25 and 31.

Accordingly, all independent claims are novel in view of Tokkonen.

It is further respectfully pointed out that the inventor of the Tokkonen reference was subject to an obligation of assignment to Nokia Corporation (same assignee as the subject application) at the time the subject claimed invention was made, and thus pursuant to 35 USC Section 103(c)/102(e), patentability is not precluded under 35 USC Section 103 for at least this reason.


In view of the foregoing, all of Applicant's independent claims are believed to be patentable and should be allowed. Although the dependent claims are believed to contain their own patentable subject matter, these claims also are patentable at least in view of their dependency from an allowable independent claim.

All issues having been addressed, the subject application is in condition for immediate allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to enter and consider this Amendment, and withdraw the outstanding rejection. A Notice of Allowance is therefore respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner have any questions or believe that a further discussion would help advance the prosecution of the application, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact undersigned attorney at the telephone number provided below.



Respectfully submitted:


Harry F. Smith
Reg. No.: 32,493

1/15/2010
Date

Customer No.: 29683
HARRINGTON & SMITH, ATTORNEYS AT LAW, LLC
4 Research Drive
Shelton, CT 06484-6212
Telephone: (203) 925-9400
Facsimile: (203) 944-0245

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail on the date shown below in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Jan. 15, 2010
Date

J. Droniak
Name of Person Making Deposit